



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/741,512	12/19/2003	Anil Kumar Chebolu	BS030708	6302
38516 7590 02/04/2008 SCOTT P. ZIMMERMAN, PLLC PO BOX 3822 CARY, NC 27519			EXAMINER LE, CANH	
			ART UNIT 2139	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/04/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/741,512

Applicant(s)

CHEBOLU ET AL.

Examiner

Canh Le

Art Unit

2139

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8,11-29,31-50 and 52-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8,11-29,31-50 and 52-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/21/2007.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to the application filed on 11/21/2007.

Claims 9-10, 30, and 51 have been cancelled.

Claims 1, 22, and 43 have been amended.

Claims 1-8, 11-29, 31-50, and 52-63 have been examined and are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/21/2007 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/21/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With regard to claim 1, The Applicant argues that:

"Beilinson describes that settings for a computer are made local to that computer and then replicated to other computers in the network. Beilinson does not

disclose that changes may be made on a computer which affect other computers and not the computer where the changes were made. For at least this reason, Beilinson fails to teach or suggest "a control unit installed on a computer to control access to use of the computer according to settings specified by an administrator for at least one user of the computer, wherein the administrator can input changes to the settings locally to the computer and remotely from the computer on another computer to which the settings do not apply; and a reporting unit installed on the computer to collect information from the computer on which local computer applications the respective user is attempting to access on the computer, the information being compiled in a report regarding the respective user, the report being made accessible to the administrator from a remote database,"

The Examiner respectfully disagrees:

Beilinson teaches a control unit installed on a computer to control access to use of the computer according to settings specified by an administrator for at least one user of the computer, wherein the administrator can input changes to the settings locally to the computer and remotely from the computer on another computer to which the settings do not apply **[See, abstract; par. [0004]; lines 9-13; par. [0048]-[0060]; par. [0051], lines 5-8; fig. 5; [par. [0070]]** ; and a reporting unit installed on the computer to collect information from the computer on which local computer applications the respective user is attempting to access on the computer, the information being compiled in a report regarding the respective user, the report

being made accessible to the administrator from a remote database [See, par. [0010]; par. [0047]; par. [0070]]. Furthermore, Beilinson discloses settings assigned to a user by the administrator on a computer are capable of being replicated on another computer and are intended to follow the user from computer to computer in the local network [See par. [0007]; par. [0019]; par. [0020]; par. [0038]].

Claim 22 and claim 43 have similar limitations as claim 1 (See the same argument as described in claim 1 above).

Therefore, the Examiner asserts that cited prior does teach or suggest the subject matter recited amended claim 1.

With regards to the rejection under 35 USC 101, the applicant argues about the present claims 1-42 recite a computer which include physical hardware components and therefore the claims do not merely recite software components. "Claim 1 recites an access control unit installed on a computer and a reporting unit installed on the computer. Paragraph [0039] of the specification explains that the "access control unit 155 of one embodiment can be implemented in software, firmware, hardware, or a combination thereof". The access control unit can be software module installed on a computer.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees that the paragraph [0039] gives an access control unit 155 an alternative way to implement in software, firmware, hardware, or a combination.

“Paragraph [0039] The access control unit 155 of one embodiment can be implemented in software, firmware, hardware, or a combination thereof. Preferably, the access control unit 155 is implemented in software, as an executable program, and is executed by a special or general-purpose digital computer 106, such as a personal computer, workstation, minicomputer, or mainframe computer. In various embodiments, the access control unit 155, as software, is downloaded from the Internet by the general-purpose computer 106 and subsequently installed on the general-purpose computer 106. In some other embodiments, the access control unit 155, is provided via computer disks, computer cards, or other file-storage devices, or is pre-installed on the general-purpose computer 106.”

The claim language does not specify to implement in hardware. Therefore, It can be implemented in software. The claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 1 should be rewritten to cover hardware only.

Similarly for claim 22, “The specification explains that operation which are capable of being performed in software may also be implemented in hardware or a combination thereof. See paragraph [0039]”. Claim 22 should be rewritten to cover hardware only.

The fact that Examiner may not have specifically responded to any particular arguments made by Applicant and Applicant’s Representative should not be construed as indicating Examiner’s agreement therewith.

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As per claims 1-21:

The language in claim 1 raises an issue because the claim is directed merely to software modules (i.e. a control unit, a reporting unit to collect information). The system for controlling computer access in claim 1 does not have the physical hardware components. There is no actual physical component for a control unit and a report unit of the system. There are GUIs setting specified by an administrator and collecting information from a user that are not tied to an article of manufacture which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 2-21 are dependent claims of claim 1 and rejected with the same reason.

Claim 1 should be rewritten to cover hardware only.

As per claims 22-42:

The language in claim 22 raises an issue because the claim is directed merely to software modules (i.e. specifying settings...; controlling access...; collecting information

...; compiling information) that are not tied to an article of manufacture which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basic of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 23-42 are dependent claims of claim 22 and rejected with the same reason.

Claim 22 should be rewritten to cover hardware only.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 22-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. "means for specifying settings..", "means for locally controlling..." , "means for collecting information..." , "means for compiling ..." , "means for specifying in the report a duration ..." , "means for specifying, in the report, identification ..." , "means for specifying in the report the computer applications..." , "means for specifying in the report the computer applications..." , "means for authorizing the respective user access to a ..." , "means for prohibiting the respective user access ..." , "means for storing the report of the respective user ..." , "means for updating the report with new collected ..." , "means for compiling the additional information ..." ,

"means for authorizing the respective user to have access ...", "means for prohibiting the respective user to have access ..." critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976).

Claim 22 recites,

"means for specifying settings.." in line 2,
"means for locally controlling..." in line 4,
"means for collecting information..." in line 8, and
"means for compiling ..." in line 10.

Claim 23 recites:

"means for specifying in the report a duration ..." in line 2.

Claim 24 recites:

"means for specifying, in the report, identification ..." in line 2.

Claim 25 recites:

"means for specifying in the report the computer applications..." in line 2.

Claim 26 recites:

"means for specifying in the report the computer applications..." in line 2.

Claim 28 recites:

"means for authorizing the respective user access to a ..." in line 2.

Claim 29 recites:

"means for prohibiting the respective user access ..." in line 2.

Claim 31 recites:

“means for storing the report of the respective user ...” in line 2.

Claim 32 recites:

“means for updating the report with new collected ...” in line 2.

Claim 36 recites:

“means for compiling the additional information ...” in line 4.

Claim 41 recites:

“means for authorizing the respective user to have access ...” in line 2.

Claim 42 recites:

“means for prohibiting the respective user to have access ...” in line 2.

Claims 23-29 and 31-42 depend on claims 12, 27, 32 and 36 rejected with the same reason.

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The Office cautions the Applicant about the addition of a new subject matter to the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, 15-19, 22-26, 36-40, 43-47, and 57-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Beilinson et al.** (US2004/0003279 A1).

As per claim 1:

Beilinson teaches a system for controlling computer access, comprising:

(a) a control unit installed on a computer to control access to use of the computer according to settings specified by an administrator for at least one user of the computer [abstract; par. [0004]; lines 9-13; par. [0048]-[0060]; par. [0051], lines 5-8; **A parent can use sub-category 288 to set specific times during the day that a child is allowed to use the computer. Also, an administrator can limit an employee's allowable login hours to the hours that the employee regularly works]** wherein the a administrator can input changes to the settings locally to the computer and remotely from the computer on another computer to which the settings do not apply [par. [0070]; **"fig. 5 is an embodiment of the system 500 of the present invention. Group policy objects 510 which circulate around a local network 512 hold the user authorization settings that have been configured through the system controls 514 typically through an administrator's computer 516. The local network 512 needed to support the invention could be a**

traditional LAN or WAN. However, it could also be any communications link between two or more computers. So, to be part of the local network 512, a computer needs to be able to communicate with at least one other computer in the local network 512 and needs to be identified as part of the local network 512 ...”]; and

a reporting unit installed on the computer to collect information from the computer on which local computer applications the respective user is attempting to access on the computer, the information being compiled in a report regarding the respective user, the report being made accessible to the administrator from a remote data base [par. [0010], “Desired data is collected which can be distilled into reports on total system usage, computer function usage, function process time, unsuccessful computer function usage attempts and the like. The administrator may apply various filters to the raw data in order to generate reports containing only desired information.... The administrator is further provided with the ability to monitor a user's activity via a read-only view of a user's computer display”; par. [0044]; “The monitoring and auditing component 212 is used to view a user machine by the administrator, to collect user activity data and to generate reports”; par. [0047]; par. [0070]].

As per claim 2:

Beilinson further teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the report includes a duration of time the respective user has accessed a particular computer application

[abstract; “The invention enables an administrator to restrict a user’s logon hours, logon duration, access to computer functions, and access to applications based on content rating”; par. [0006]; par. [0008]; par. [0022]; par. [0045], lines 5-9; “Reports can be generated on total system usage, computer function usage, function process time, unsuccessful computer function usage attempts and the like. Other reports could be generated, and the invention is not limited to the particular reports generated”].

As per claim 3:

Beilinson further teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the report includes identification of one or more chronological times in which the respective user has accessed a particular computer application **[abstract; “The invention enables an administrator to restrict a user’s logon hours, logon duration, access to computer functions, and access to applications based on content rating”; par. [0006]; par. [0008]; par. [0022]; par. [0045], lines 5-9; “Reports can be generated on total system usage, computer function usage, function process time, unsuccessful computer function usage attempts and the like. Other reports could be generated, and the invention is not limited to the particular reports generated”].**

As per claim 4:

Beilinson further teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the report includes the computer applications the respective user is denied access to according to the settings specified by the administrator **[abstract; par. [006]; “the implementation of such a**

system includes restricting a user's logon hours, logon duration, access to computer functions, and access to applications. In addition, the implementation of such a system includes enabling an administrator to temporarily restrict or extend a user's normally allowed access privileges as well as monitor, audit, and obtain reports of a user's computer function usage"; par. [009]; par. [0054], lines 7-8; par. [0057], lines 3-4; par. [0065], lines 11-13; "the administrator can thus easily set time of day restrictions or content rating restrictions, for example, and can also specify which reports, if any are desired"; par. [0063], lines 14-15; " a system could be denied until the day after the child's math final"]].

As per claim 5:

Beilinson teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the report includes the computer applications to which the respective user is granted access [abstract; par. [006]; par. [009]; par. [0045]; "Reports can be generated on total system usage, computer function usage, function process time, unsuccessful computer function usage attempts and the like. Other reports could be generated, and the invention is not limited to the particular reports generated"; par. [0059], lines 5-6; a child's daily access to computer games can be limited to an amount defined by the parent; par. [0065]].

As per claim 15:

Beilinson further teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the reporting unit further

collects additional information on which services of a designated computer application the respective user is attempting to access on the computer, the additional information being compiled in a report regarding the respective user [par. [0010], “Desired data is collected which can be distilled into reports on total system usage, computer function usage, function process time, unsuccessful computer function usage attempts and the like. The administrator may apply various filters to the raw data in order to generate reports containing only desired information.... The administrator is further provided with the ability to monitor a user's activity via a read-only view of a user's computer display”; par. [0044]; “The monitoring and auditing component 212 is used to view a user machine by the administrator, to collect user activity data and to generate reports”; par. [0047]; par. [0059], lines 5-6; “ a child's daily access to computer games can be limited to an amount defined by the parent”; an additional information can be a child's daily access to computer games].

As per claim 16:

Beilinson further teaches the system of claim 15, wherein the report further includes a duration of time the respective user has accessed a particular service of the designated computer application [abstract; “The invention enables an administrator to restrict a user's logon hours, logon duration, access to computer functions, and access to applications based on content rating”; par. [0006]; par. [0008]; par. [0022]; par. [0045], lines 5-9; “Reports can be generated on total system usage,

computer function usage, function process time, unsuccessful computer function usage attempts and the like. Other reports could be generated, and the invention is not limited to the particular reports generated”].

As per claim 17:

Beilinson further teaches the system of claim 15, wherein the report further identification of one or more chronological times in which the respective user has accessed the particular service of the designated computer application **[abstract; “The invention enables an administrator to restrict a user's logon hours, logon duration, access to computer functions, and access to applications based on content rating”; par. [0006]; par. [0008]; par. [0022]; par. [0045], lines 5-9; “Reports can be generated on total system usage, computer function usage, function process time, unsuccessful computer function usage attempts and the like. Other reports could be generated, and the invention is not limited to the particular reports generated”].**

As per claim 18:

Beilinson further teaches the system of claim 15, wherein the report includes the services the respective user is denied access to according to the settings specified by the administrator **[abstract; par. [006]; “the implementation of such a system includes restricting a user's logon hours, logon duration, access to computer functions, and access to applications. In addition, the implementation of such a**

system includes enabling an administrator to temporarily restrict or extend a user's normally allowed access privileges as well as monitor, audit, and obtain reports of a user's computer function usage"; par. [0054], lines 7-8; par. [0057], lines 3-4; par. [0065], lines 11-13; "the administrator can thus easily set time of day restrictions or content rating restrictions, for example, and can also specify which reports, if any are desired"; par. [0063], lines 14-15; " a system could be denied until the day after the child's math final"].

As per claim 19:

Beilinson further teaches the system of claim 15, wherein the report includes the services the respective user is granted access to according to the settings specified by the administrator [abstract; par. [006]; par. [009]; par. [0045]; "Reports can be generated on total system usage, computer function usage, function process time, unsuccessful computer function usage attempts and the like. Other reports could be generated, and the invention is not limited to the particular reports generated"; par. [0059], lines 5-6; a child's daily access to computer games can be limited to an amount defined by the parent; par. [0065]].

As per claims 22-26, 36-40:

35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, has been invoked regarding claims 22-26 and 36-40. The claims recite "means for" plus a function. The structures corresponding to

the functions given within claims 22-26 and 36-40 are being interpreted by the Examiner as given within paragraph [0048] of the instant applications specification.

Claims 22-26 and 36-40 are essentially the same as claims 1-5 and 15-19 accordingly except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a system for controlling computer access comprising means for function rather a system and rejected under the same reasons as applied above.

As per claims 43-47, 57-61:

Claims 43-47 and 57-61 are essentially the same as claims 1-5 and 15-19 accordingly except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a method rather a system comprising and rejected under the same reasons as applied above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-8, 11, 20-21, 27-29, 31-32, 41-42, 48-50, 52-53, and 62-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Beilinson et al.** (US2004/0003279 A1) in view of **Mathew et al.** (US 2004/0003071 A1).

As per claim 6:

Beilinson does not teach the system wherein the report is in the form of a web page.

However, Mathew teaches the system wherein the report is in the form of a web page **[fig. 17; par. [0071]; a history summary report implemented as a Web page using a markup language]**.

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Beilinson of the invention by including the step of Mathew because it would allow administrator control component is operable to track and store the user's allowed and blocked online action, generate a history summary report to administrator **[Mathew, fig. 17, par. [0016]]**.

As per claim 7:

Mathew teaches the system of claim 6, wherein the report provides a mechanism for the administrator to authorize the respective user access to a particular application to which the respective was previously denied access **[fig. 17, section of Blocked Web sites, third column; an administrator can select "Allow site"; fig. 16, box 1610 and 1612; par. [0078], lines 1-5 and lines 9-12]**. Motivation is the same as claim 6.

As per claim 8:

Mathew teaches the system of claim 6, wherein the report provides a mechanism for the administrator to prohibit the respective user access to a particular application **[fig. 17, section of Visited sites, third column; an administrator can select “Block site”; fig. 16, box 1610 and 1614; par. [0079], lines 1-10]**. Motivation is the same as claim 6.

As per claim 11:

Beilinson does not teach explicitly teach the system wherein the reporting unit updates the report with new collected information after an occurrence of at least one particular computer event.

However, Mathew teaches the system wherein the reporting unit updates the report with new collected information after an occurrence of at least one particular computer event **[fig. 5B; fig. 5C; par. [0052]; “the parental control server 204 receives the request resolution and update the consent database 208 with request resolution”]**. Motivation is the same as claim 6.

As per claim 20:

Beilinson does not explicitly teach the system wherein the report provides a mechanism for the administrator to authorize the respective user access to a particular service to which the respective user was previously denied access.

However, Mathew teaches the system wherein the report provides a mechanism for the administrator to authorize the respective user access to a particular service to which the respective user was previously denied access **[fig. 17, section of Blocked Web sites, third column; an administrator can select “Allow site”; fig. 16, box 1610 and 1612; par. [0078], lines 1-5 and lines 9-12]**.

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Beilinson of the invention by including the step of Mathew because it would allow administrator control component is operable to track and store the user's allowed and blocked online action, generate a history summary report to administrator **[Mathew, fig. 17, par. [0016]]**.

As per claim 21:

Mathew further teaches the system of claim 15, wherein the report provides a mechanism for the administrator to prohibit the respective user access to a particular service to which the respective user was previously granted access **[fig. 17, section of Visited sites, third column; an administrator can select “Block site”; fig. 16, box 1610 and 1614; par. [0079], lines 1-10]**. Motivation is the same as claim 20.

As per claims 27-29, 31-32, 41-42:

35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, has been invoked regarding claims 27-29, 31-32 and 41-42. The claims recite “means for” plus a function. The structures corresponding

to the functions given within claims 27-29, 31-32 and 41-42 are being interpreted by the Examiner as given within paragraph [0048] of the instant applications specification.

Claims 27-29, 32 and 41-42 are essentially the same as claims 6-8, 11 and 20-21 accordingly except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a system for controlling computer access comprising means for function rather a system and rejected under the same reasons as applied above.

Regard to claim 31, Beilinson and Mathew teach subject matter as described in claim 27. Mathew further teaches means for storing the report of the respective user **[par. [0009]; lines 6-8; par. [0069], line 10; a summary information is stored]**.

As per claims 48-50, 52-53, 62-63:

Claims 48-50, 53 and 62-63 are essentially the same as claim 6-8, 11 and 20-21 accordingly except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a method rather a system comprising and rejected under the same reasons as applied above.

Regard to claim 52, Beilinson and Mathew teach subject matter as described in claim 48. Mathew further teaches storing the report of the respective user **[par. [0009]; lines 6-8; par. [0069], line 10; a summary information is stored]**.

Claims 12-13, 33-34, and 54-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Beilinson et al.** (US2004/0003279 A1) and **Mathew et al.** (US 2004/0003071 A1) in view of **Rowland** (US 6,405,318 B1).

As per claim 12:

Beilinson and Mathew teach the system as described in claim 11.

Beilinson and Mathew do not teach a system wherein the particular computer event includes the respective user logging on the computer.

However, Rowland teaches a system wherein the particular computer event includes the respective user logging on the computer **[col. 4, lines 30-38; a system monitors logs (record) all logins and logouts for the target host 21]**.

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Beilinson and Mathew of the invention by including the step of Rowland because it would be able to detect intrusion as they are occurring or soon after in real-time system **[Rowland, fig. 17, par. [0068], lines 1-3]**.

As per claim 13:

Beilinson and Mathew teach the system as described in claim 11.

Beilinson and Mathew do not teach a system wherein the particular computer event includes the respective user logging off the computer.

Rowland teaches a system wherein the particular computer event includes the respective user logging off the computer **[col. 4, lines 30-38; a system monitors logs (record) all logins and logouts for the target host 21]**.

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Beilinson and Mathew of the invention by including the step of Rowland because it would be able to detect intrusion as they are occurring or soon after in real-time system [Rowland, fig. 17, par. [0068], lines 1-3].

As per claims 33-34:

35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, has been invoked regarding claims 33-34. The claims recite "means for" plus a function. The structures corresponding to the functions given within claims 33-34 are being interpreted by the Examiner as given within paragraph [0048] of the instant applications specification.

Claims 33-34 are essentially the same as claims 12-13 accordingly except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a system for controlling computer access comprising means for function rather a system and rejected under the same reasons as applied above.

As per claims 54-55:

Claims 54-55 are essentially the same as claim 12-13 accordingly except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a method rather a system comprising and rejected under the same reasons as applied above.

Claims 14, 35, and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Beilinson et al.** (US2004/0003279 A1) and **Mathew et al.** (US 2004/0003071 A1) in view of **Terry** (US 2002/0026605 A1).

As per claim 14:

Beilinson and Mathew teach the system as described in claim 11.

Beilinson and Mathew do not teach a system wherein the particular computer event includes the start up of the computer.

However, Terry teaches a system wherein the particular computer event includes the start up of the computer [par. [0051], lines 1-3; “ **tracking of all internal machine configuration profiles (start-up) in a computer unit 105 having the client application 110**”].

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Beilinson and Mathew of the invention by including the step of Terry because it would provide the ability to report in a real-time environment to the monitor station and the ability to record and analyze a “penetration pattern” of unknown program [**Terry, par. [0016] and par. [0017]**].

As per claim 35:

35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, has been invoked regarding claim 35. The claims recite “means for” plus a function. The structures corresponding to the functions given within claim 35 are being interpreted by the Examiner as given within paragraph [0048] of the instant applications specification.

Claim 35 is essentially the same as claim 14 accordingly except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a system for controlling computer access comprising means for function rather a system and rejected under the same reasons as applied above.

As per claim 56:

Claim 56 is essentially the same as claim 14 accordingly except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a method rather a system comprising and rejected under the same reasons as applied above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Canh Le whose telephone number is 571-270-1380. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7:30AM to 5:00PM other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/741,512
Art Unit: 2139

Page 26

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Canh Le
January 20, 2008


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100